

On the structure of classical realizability models of ZF

Jean-Louis Krivine

P.P.S. group, University Paris-Diderot, CNRS

krivine@pps.univ-paris-diderot.fr

August 11, 2014

Abstract. In [4, 5, 6], we have introduced the technique of *classical realizability*, which permits to extend the Curry-Howard correspondence between proofs and programs, to Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory. The models of ZF we obtain in this way, are called *realizability models*; this technique is an extension of the method of forcing, in which the ordered sets (sets of *conditions*) are replaced with more complex first order structures called *realizability algebras*.

We show here that every realizability model $\mathcal{N}$ of ZF contains a transitive submodel, which has the same ordinals as $\mathcal{N}$, and which is an elementary extension of the ground model. It follows that the constructible universe of a realizability model is an elementary extension of the constructible universe of the ground model.

We obtain this result by showing the existence of an ultrafilter on the *characteristic Boolean algebra* $\mathfrak{B}$ of the realizability model, which is defined in [5, 6].

Introduction

We use here the basic notions and notations of the theory of *classical realizability*, which was developed in [4, 5, 6].

We consider a model $\mathcal{M}$ of $\text{ZF} + \text{V} = \text{L}$, which we call the *ground model*¹ and, in $\mathcal{M}$, a *realizability algebra* $\mathcal{A} = (\Lambda, \Pi, \Lambda \star \Pi, \text{QP}, \perp)$.

Λ is the set of *terms*, Π is the set of *stacks*, $\Lambda \star \Pi$ is the set of *processes*, $\text{QP} \subset \Lambda$ is the set of *proof-like terms*, and $\perp$ is a distinguished subset of $\Lambda \star \Pi$.

They satisfy the axioms of *realizability algebra*, which are given in [4] or [6].

In the model $\mathcal{M}$, we use the language of ZF with the binary relation symbols $\notin, \subset$ and function symbols, which we shall define when needed, by means of formulas of ZF.

We can now build (see [4]) the *realizability model* $\mathcal{N}$, which has the same set of individuals as $\mathcal{M}$, the truth value set of which is $\mathcal{P}(\Pi)$, endowed with a suitable Boolean algebra structure.

¹In fact, it suffices that $\mathcal{M}$ satisfy the *choice principle CP*, which is written as follows, in the language of ZF with a new binary relation symbol $\triangleleft$: “ $\triangleleft$ is a well ordering relation on $\mathcal{M}$ ”.

It is well known that, in every countable model of ZFC, we can define such a binary symbol, so as to get a model of $\text{ZF} + \text{CP}$. Thus, $\text{ZF} + \text{CP}$ is a *conservative extension* of ZFC.

The language of this model has three binary relation symbols $\notin, \in, \subset$, and the same function symbols as the model $\mathcal{M}$, with the same interpretation.

The *formulas* are built as usual, from atomic formulas, *with the only logical symbols* $\perp, \rightarrow, \forall$. We shall use the notations :

$\neg F$ for $F \rightarrow \perp$; $F_1, \dots, F_n \rightarrow F$ for $(F_1 \rightarrow (\dots \rightarrow F_n) \rightarrow F$;

$\exists x F$ for $\neg \forall x \neg F$; $\exists x \{F_1, \dots, F_n\}$ for $\neg \forall x (F_1, \dots, F_n \rightarrow \perp)$.

Notation. We shall often use the notation $\vec{x}$ for a finite sequence $x_1, \dots, x_n$; for instance, we shall write $F[\vec{x}]$ for $F[x_1, \dots, x_n]$.

By means of the completeness theorem, we obtain from $\mathcal{N}$ an ordinary model $\mathcal{N}'$, with truth values in $\{0, 1\}$. The set of individuals of $\mathcal{N}'$ generally *strictly contains* $\mathcal{N}$.

The elements of $\mathcal{N}'$ (resp. $\mathcal{M}$) are called *individuals of $\mathcal{N}$* (resp. $\mathcal{M}$). The individuals are generally denoted by $a, b, c, \dots, a_0, a_1, \dots$.

In [4] or [5], we define a theory ZF_ε , written in this language. We show that it is a *conservative extension* of ZF, and that the model $\mathcal{N}$ *satisfies the axioms of ZF_ε* , which means that each of these axioms is *realized by a proof-like term*.

Given a term $\xi \in \Lambda$ and a closed formula $F[a_1, \dots, a_n]$ in the language of ZF_ε , with parameters $a_1, \dots, a_n$ in $\mathcal{N}$ (or, which is the same, in $\mathcal{M}$), we shall write :

$\xi \Vdash F[a_1, \dots, a_n]$ in order to say that the term ξ realizes $F[a_1, \dots, a_n]$.

The truth value of this formula is a subset of Π , denoted by $\|F[a_1, \dots, a_n]\|$.

We write $\Vdash F[a_1, \dots, a_n]$ in order to say that $F[a_1, \dots, a_n]$ is realized by some proof-like term.

Thus, the model $\mathcal{N}'$ satisfies ZF_ε ; therefore, in $\mathcal{N}'$, we can define a model of ZF, denoted $\mathcal{N}'_\varepsilon$, in which the equality is interpreted by *the extensional equivalence* denoted by $x \simeq y$ (that is $x \subset y \wedge y \subset x$).

The general properties of the realizability models are described in [6] ; we shall use the definitions and notations of this paper.

In what follows, unless otherwise stated, each formula of ZF_ε must be interpreted in $\mathcal{N}$ (its truth value is a subset of Π) or, if one prefers, in $\mathcal{N}'$ (then its truth value is 0 or 1). If the formula must be interpreted in $\mathcal{M}$, (in that case, it does not contains the symbol $\notin$) it will be explicitly stated.

Function symbols

Notations. The formula $\forall z (z \notin y \rightarrow z \notin x)$ is denoted by $x \subseteq y$ (*strong inclusion*) ; the formula $x \subseteq y \wedge y \subseteq x$ is denoted by $x \cong y$ (*strong extensional equivalence*).

We recall that $\subset$ and $\simeq$ are the symbols of inclusion and of extensional equivalence of ZF : $x \subset y \equiv \forall z (z \notin y \rightarrow z \notin x)$; $x \simeq y \equiv (x \subset y \wedge y \subset x)$.

Function symbols associated with axioms of ZF_ε

In this section, we define a function symbol for each of the following axioms of ZF_ε : comprehension, pairing, union, power set and collection.

Comprehension.

For each formula $F[y, \vec{z}]$ of ZF_ε , (where $\vec{z}$ is a finite sequence of variables $z_1, \dots, z_n$) we define, in $\mathcal{M}$, a symbol of function of arity $n+1$, denoted provisionally by $\text{Compr}_F(x, \vec{z})$, (Compr is an abbreviation for *Comprehension*) by setting :

$$\text{Compr}_F(a, \vec{c}) = \{(b, \xi \bullet \pi) ; (b, \pi) \in a, \xi \Vdash F[b, \vec{c}]\}.$$

It was shown in [6] (and it is easily checked) that we have :

$$\|b \notin \text{Compr}_F(a, \vec{c})\| = \|F[b, \vec{c}] \rightarrow b \notin a\|. \text{ Thus, we have :}$$

$$\vdash \forall x \forall y \forall \vec{z} (y \notin \text{Compr}_F(x, \vec{z}) \rightarrow (F[y, \vec{z}] \rightarrow y \notin x)) ;$$

$$\vdash \forall x \forall y \forall \vec{z} ((F[y, \vec{z}] \rightarrow y \notin x) \rightarrow y \notin \text{Compr}_F(x, \vec{z})).$$

Therefore, instead of $\text{Compr}_F(x, \vec{z})$, we shall use for this function symbol, the more intuitive notation $\{y \varepsilon x ; F[y, \vec{z}]\}$, in which y is a *bounded variable*.

Pairing.

We define the following binary function symbol :

$$\text{pair}(x, y) = \{z \varepsilon \{x, y\} \times \Pi ; (z = x) \vee (z = y)\}.$$

It is easily checked that we have the desired property :

$$\vdash \forall x \forall y \forall z (z \varepsilon \text{pair}(x, y) \leftrightarrow z = x \vee z = y).$$

Remark. We could also define a symbol $\text{pair}(x, y)$, with this property, directly in $\mathcal{M}$, as follows :

$$\text{pair}(x, y) = \{(x, \underline{1} \bullet \pi) ; \pi \in \Pi\} \cup \{(y, \underline{0} \bullet \pi) ; \pi \in \Pi\}.$$

In the sequel, when working in $\mathcal{N}$, we shall use the (natural) abbreviations :

$\{x, y\}$ for $\text{pair}(x, y)$; (x, y) for $\text{pair}(\text{pair}(x, x), \text{pair}(x, y))$.

Union and power set.

We define below two unary function symbols $\overline{\bigcup}x$ and $\overline{\mathcal{P}}(x)$, such that :

$$\vdash \forall x \forall z (z \varepsilon \overline{\bigcup}x \leftrightarrow (\exists y \varepsilon x) z \varepsilon y).$$

$$\vdash \forall x (\forall y \varepsilon \overline{\mathcal{P}}(x)) (\forall z \varepsilon y) (z \varepsilon x) ; \quad \vdash \forall x \forall y (\exists y' \varepsilon \overline{\mathcal{P}}(x)) \forall z (z \varepsilon y' \leftrightarrow z \varepsilon x \wedge z \varepsilon y).$$

Theorem 1. Let $\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{Q}$ be the unary function symbols defined in $\mathcal{M}$ as follows :

$$\mathcal{V}(a) = \text{Cl}(a) \times \Pi \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Q}(a) = \mathcal{P}(\text{Cl}(a) \times \Pi) \times \Pi$$

where $\text{Cl}(a)$ is the transitive closure of a . Then, we have :

$$i) \quad \vdash \forall x \forall y \forall z (z \varepsilon y, z \notin \mathcal{V}(x) \rightarrow y \notin x).$$

$$ii) \quad \vdash \forall x \forall \vec{z} (\{y \varepsilon x ; F[y, \vec{z}]\} \varepsilon \mathcal{Q}(x)) \quad \text{for every formula } F[x, \vec{z}] \text{ of } ZF_\varepsilon.$$

i) Let a, b, c be individuals in $\mathcal{M}$, $\xi, \eta \in \Lambda$ and $\pi \in \Pi$ such that :

$$\xi \Vdash c \varepsilon b, \eta \Vdash c \notin \mathcal{V}(a) \text{ and } \pi \in \|b \notin a\| ; \text{ we have therefore } (b, \pi) \in a.$$

We must show $\xi \star \eta \bullet \pi \in \underline{\mathbb{L}}$.

We show that $\|c \notin b\| \subset \|c \notin \mathcal{V}(a)\|$: indeed, if $\rho \in \|c \notin b\|$, then we have $(c, \rho) \in b$. But we have $(b, \pi) \in a$ and thus $c \in \text{Cl}(a)$ and it follows that $\|c \notin \mathcal{V}(a)\| = \Pi$.

Therefore, $\eta \Vdash c \notin b$; by hypothesis on ξ , we have $\xi \star \eta \bullet \pi \in \underline{\mathbb{L}}$.

ii) Let $a, \vec{c}$ be individuals in $\mathcal{M}$; we must show $\vdash A \varepsilon \mathcal{Q}(a)$, where $A = \{y \varepsilon a ; F[y, \vec{c}]\}$. We have $A = \{(b, \xi \bullet \pi) ; (b, \pi) \in a, \xi \Vdash F[b, \vec{c}]\}$ and therefore $A \subset \text{Cl}(a) \times \Pi$. But we have :

$$\|A \notin \mathcal{Q}(a)\| = \{\pi \in \Pi ; (A, \pi) \in \mathcal{Q}(a)\} = \Pi \quad \text{and therefore} \quad \vdash A \varepsilon \mathcal{Q}(a).$$

Q.E.D.

We can now define the function symbols $\overline{\bigcup}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{P}}$ by setting :

$$\overline{\bigcup}x = \{z \varepsilon \mathcal{V}(x) ; (\exists y \varepsilon x) z \varepsilon y\} ; \quad \overline{\mathcal{P}}(x) = \{y \varepsilon \mathcal{Q}(x) ; y \subseteq x\}.$$

Collection.

We shall use in the following, function symbols associated with a strong form of the *collection scheme*.

In order to define these function symbols, it is convenient to decompose them, which is done in theorems 2, 3 and 4.

Theorem 2. *For each formula $F(x, \vec{z})$ of ZF_ε , we have :*

$$\Vdash \forall \vec{z} (\exists x F(x, \vec{z}) \rightarrow (\exists x \varepsilon \phi_F(\vec{z})) F(x, \vec{z})) ; \quad \Vdash \forall \vec{z} (\forall x \varepsilon \phi_F(\vec{z})) F(x, \vec{z})$$

where ϕ_F is a function symbol defined in $\mathcal{M}$.

We show $\lambda x(x) \Vdash \forall x (x \varepsilon \Phi_F(\vec{z}) \rightarrow F(x, \vec{z})) \rightarrow \forall x F(x, \vec{z})$ where the function symbol Φ_F is defined as follows :

By means of the collection scheme in $\mathcal{M}$, we define a function symbol $\Psi(\vec{z})$ such that :

$$\|\forall x F(x, \vec{z})\| = \bigcup_{x \in \Psi(\vec{z})} \|F(x, \vec{z})\| \quad \text{and we set} \quad \Phi_F(\vec{z}) = \Psi(\vec{z}) \times \Pi.$$

Let $\xi \Vdash \forall x (x \varepsilon \Phi_F(\vec{z}) \rightarrow F(x, \vec{z}))$ and $\pi \in \|\forall x F(x, \vec{z})\|$.

Then $\pi \in \|F(x, \vec{z})\|$ for some $x \in \Psi(\vec{z})$, and therefore $\Vdash x \varepsilon \Phi_F(\vec{z})$ and $\xi \star \Vdash \pi \in \Pi$.

Therefore, by replacing F with $\neg F$, we have $\Vdash \exists x F(x, \vec{z}) \rightarrow (\exists x \varepsilon \Phi_{\neg F}(\vec{z})) F(x, \vec{z})$.

Thus, we only need to set $\phi_F(\vec{z}) = \{x \varepsilon \Phi_{\neg F}(\vec{z}) ; F(x, \vec{z})\}$.

Q.E.D.

Theorem 3. *For every formula $F(y, \vec{z})$ of ZF_ε , we have :*

$$\Vdash \forall \vec{z} (\exists x \forall y (F(y, \vec{z}) \rightarrow y \varepsilon x) \rightarrow \forall y (F(y, \vec{z}) \leftrightarrow y \varepsilon \gamma_F(\vec{z})))$$

where γ_F is a function symbol defined in $\mathcal{M}$.

By theorem 2, we have :

$$\Vdash \forall \vec{z} (\exists x \forall y (F(y, \vec{z}) \rightarrow y \varepsilon x) \rightarrow (\exists x \varepsilon \phi(\vec{z})) \forall y (F(y, \vec{z}) \rightarrow y \varepsilon x))$$

where ϕ is a function symbol. Therefore we have, by definition of $\overline{\bigcup} \phi(\vec{z})$:

$$\Vdash \forall \vec{z} \left(\exists x \forall y (F(y, \vec{z}) \rightarrow y \varepsilon x) \rightarrow \forall y (F(y, \vec{z}) \rightarrow y \varepsilon \overline{\bigcup} \phi(\vec{z})) \right).$$

Now, we only need to set $\gamma_F(\vec{z}) = \{y \varepsilon \overline{\bigcup} \phi(\vec{z}) ; F(y, \vec{z})\}$ (comprehension scheme).

Q.E.D.

When the hypothesis $\exists x \forall y (F(y, \vec{z}) \rightarrow y \varepsilon x)$ is satisfied, we say that *the formula $F(y, \vec{z})$ defines a set*.

For the function symbol $\gamma_F(\vec{z})$, we shall use the more intuitive notation $\{y ; F(y, \vec{z})\}$, where y is a bounded variable.

Theorem 4.

Let $f(x, \vec{z})$ be a $(n+1)$ -ary function symbol (defined in $\mathcal{M}$). Then, we have :

$$\Vdash \forall a \forall y \forall \vec{z} (y \varepsilon \phi_f(a, \vec{z}) \leftrightarrow (\exists x \varepsilon a) (y = f(x, \vec{z})))$$

where ϕ_f is a $(n+1)$ -ary function symbol.

We define, in $\mathcal{M}$, the symbol ϕ_f as follows :

Let $a_0, y_0, \vec{z}_0$ be fixed individuals in $\mathcal{M}$; we set $\phi_f(a_0, \vec{z}_0) = \{(f(x, \vec{z}_0), \pi) ; (x, \pi) \in a_0\}$.

Then, we have immediately $\|y_0 \notin \phi_f(a_0, \vec{z}_0)\| = \|\forall x (y_0 = f(x, \vec{z}_0) \hookrightarrow x \notin a_0)\|$. Therefore :

$$\Vdash \forall x (y_0 = f(x, \vec{z}_0) \hookrightarrow x \notin a_0) \leftrightarrow y_0 \notin \phi_f(a_0, \vec{z}_0) \quad \text{which gives the desired result.}$$

Q.E.D.

Remark. The *connective* $\leftrightarrow$ is defined in [5, 6].

For the function symbol $\phi_f(a, \vec{z})$, we shall use the more intuitive notation $\{f(x, \vec{z}) ; x \varepsilon a\}$, where x is a bounded variable. We call it *image of a by the function f(x)*.

Symbols for characteristic functions

Let $R(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be a n -ary relation defined in $\mathcal{M}$. Its *characteristic function*, with values in $\{0, 1\}$, will be denoted by $\langle R(x_1, \dots, x_n) \rangle$. Therefore, we have : $\mathcal{M} \models \forall \vec{x} (R(\vec{x}) \leftrightarrow \langle R(\vec{x}) \rangle = 1)$.

Therefore, in the realizability model $\mathcal{N}$, the function symbol $\langle R(\vec{x}) \rangle$ takes its values in $\mathbb{I}2$.

The theorem 8 below, shows that, if a binary relation $y \prec x$ is well founded in $\mathcal{M}$, then the relation $\langle y \prec x \rangle = 1$ is well founded in $\mathcal{N}$.

Miscellaneous symbols

In the following, we shall use some function symbols, the definition and properties of which are given in [6]. We simply recall their definition below.

- The unary function symbol $\mathbb{I}$, defined in $\mathcal{M}$ by $\mathbb{I}x = x \times \Pi$.
For any individual E of $\mathcal{M}$, the *restricted quantifier* $\forall x^{\mathbb{I}E}$ is defined in [5] or [6] by : $\|\forall x^{\mathbb{I}E} F[x]\| = \bigcup_{x \in E} \|F[x]\|$ and we have $\Vdash \forall x^{\mathbb{I}E} F[x] \leftrightarrow \forall x (x \varepsilon \mathbb{I}E \rightarrow F[x])$.
In the realizability model $\mathcal{N}$, the formula $x \varepsilon \mathbb{I}E$ may be intuitively understood as “ x is of type E ”. For instance, $\mathbb{I}2$ may be considered as *the type of booleans* and $\mathbb{I}\mathbb{N}$ as *the type of integers*.
- the function symbols $\wedge, \vee, \neg$, with domains $\{0, 1\} \times \{0, 1\}$ and $\{0, 1\}$, and values in $\{0, 1\}$, are defined in $\mathcal{M}$ by means of the usual truth tables.
These functions define, in $\mathcal{N}$, a structure of Boolean algebra on $\mathbb{I}2$.
We call it the *characteristic Boolean algebra* of the realizability model $\mathcal{N}$.
- a binary function symbol with domain $\{0, 1\} \times \mathcal{M}$, denoted by $(\alpha, x) \mapsto \alpha x$, by setting :

$$0x = \emptyset ; 1x = x.$$

In the model $\mathcal{N}$, the domain of this function is $\mathbb{I}2 \times \mathcal{N}$.

- a binary function symbol $\sqcup$ with domain $\mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M}$, by setting $x \sqcup y = x \cup y$.
Remark. The extension of this function to the model $\mathcal{N}$ is *not* the union $\cup$, which explains the use of another symbol.

Lemma 5 (Linearity).

Let f be a binary function symbol, defined in $\mathcal{M}$. Then, we have :

- $\Vdash \forall \alpha^{\mathbb{I}2} \forall x \forall y (\alpha f(x, y) = \alpha f(\alpha x, y))$.
- Moreover, if $f(\emptyset, \emptyset) = \emptyset$, then :
 $\Vdash \forall \alpha^{\mathbb{I}2} \forall \alpha'^{\mathbb{I}2} \forall x \forall y \forall x' \forall y' (\alpha \wedge \alpha' = 0 \leftrightarrow f(\alpha x \sqcup \alpha' x', \alpha y \sqcup \alpha' y') = \alpha f(x, y) \sqcup \alpha' f(x', y'))$.

Remark. The *connective* $\hookrightarrow$ is defined in [5, 6].

It suffices to check :

for (i) the two cases $\alpha = 0, 1$;

for (ii) the three cases $(\alpha, \alpha') = (0, 0), (0, 1), (1, 0)$;

which is trivial.

Q.E.D.

Well founded relations

In this section, we study properties of well founded relations in $\mathcal{N}$. All the results obtained here are, of course, trivial in ZF. The difficulties come from the fact that the relation ε of strong membership, does not satisfy extensionality.

Given a binary relation $\prec$, an individual a is said *minimal for* $\prec$, if we have $\forall x \neg(x \prec a)$. The binary relation $\prec$ is called *well founded* if we have :

$$\forall X (\forall x (\forall y (y \prec x \rightarrow y \notin X) \rightarrow x \notin X) \rightarrow \forall x (x \notin X)).$$

The intuitive meaning is that each non empty individual X has an ε -element minimal for $\prec$.

Theorem 6.

If the relation $x \prec y$ is well founded then, for every formula $F[x, \vec{z}]$ of ZF_ε , we have :

$$\forall \vec{z} (\forall x (\forall y (y \prec x \rightarrow F[y, \vec{z}]) \rightarrow F[x, \vec{z}]) \rightarrow \forall x F[x, \vec{z}]).$$

Proof by contradiction ; we consider, in $\mathcal{N}$, an individual a and a formula $G[x]$ such that :

$$(1) \quad G[a] ; \forall x (G[x] \rightarrow \exists y \{G[y], y \prec x\}).$$

We apply the axiom scheme of infinity of ZF_ε :

$$(2) \quad \exists c \{a \varepsilon c, (\forall x \varepsilon c) (\exists y F(x, y) \rightarrow (\exists y \varepsilon c) F(x, y))\}$$

by setting $F(x, y) \equiv G[x] \wedge G[y] \wedge y \prec x$. Let $b = \{x \varepsilon c ; G(x)\}$; by (1) and (2), we get $a \varepsilon b$.

We obtain a contradiction with the hypothesis, by showing $(\forall x \varepsilon b)(\exists y \varepsilon b)(y \prec x)$.

Therefore, we suppose $x \varepsilon c$ and $G[x]$; by (2), we have :

$$\exists y \{G[x], G[y], y \prec x\} \rightarrow (\exists y \varepsilon c) \{G[x], G[y], y \prec x\}.$$

By $G[x]$ and (1), we have $\exists y \{G[x], G[y], y \prec x\}$.

Therefore, we have $(\exists y \varepsilon c) \{G[y], y \prec x\}$, hence the result.

Q.E.D.

Therefore, in order to show $\forall x F[x]$, it suffices to show $\forall x (\forall y (y \prec x \rightarrow F[y]) \rightarrow F[x])$.

Then, we say that we have shown $\forall x F[x]$ *by induction on x , following the well founded relation $\prec$* .

Theorem 7. The binary relation $x \in y$ is well founded.

We must show $\forall x (\forall y (y \in x \rightarrow y \notin X) \rightarrow x \notin X) \rightarrow \forall x (x \notin X)$.

We apply theorem 6 to the well founded relation $x \varepsilon y$ and the formula $F[x] \equiv x \notin X$.

This gives : $\forall x (\forall y (y \varepsilon x \rightarrow y \notin X) \rightarrow x \notin X) \rightarrow \forall x (x \notin X)$.

Now, we have immediately $\Vdash x \notin X \rightarrow x \notin X$. Thus, it remains to show :

$$\Vdash \forall x (\forall y (y \in x \rightarrow y \notin X) \rightarrow x \notin X) \rightarrow \forall x (\forall y (y \varepsilon x \rightarrow y \notin X) \rightarrow x \notin X).$$

But we have $x \notin X \equiv \forall x'(x' \simeq x \rightarrow x' \notin X)$. Therefore, we need to show :

$\Vdash \forall x(\forall y(y \in x \rightarrow y \notin X) \rightarrow x \notin X), \forall y(y \varepsilon x \rightarrow y \notin X), x' \simeq x \rightarrow x' \notin X$; or else :

$\Vdash \forall y(y \varepsilon x \rightarrow y \notin X), x' \simeq x \rightarrow \forall y(y \in x' \rightarrow y \notin X)$.

Now, from $x' \simeq x, y \in x'$, we deduce $y \in x$. Thus, there is some $y' \simeq y$ such that $y' \varepsilon x$.

Then, from $\forall y(y \varepsilon x \rightarrow y \notin X)$, we deduce $y' \notin X$, and therefore $y \notin X$.

Q.E.D.

For instance, in the following, we shall use the fact that, if there is an ordinal ρ such that $F[\rho]$, then there exists a least such ordinal, for any formula $F[\rho]$ written in the language of ZF_ε . This results from theorem 7.

Preservation of well-foundedness

Theorem 8. *Let $\prec$ be a well founded binary relation, defined in the ground model $\mathcal{M}$. Then, the relation $\langle y \prec x \rangle = 1$ is well founded in $\mathcal{N}$. In fact, we have :*

$$\mathbf{Y} \Vdash \forall X (\forall x(\forall y(\langle y \prec x \rangle = 1 \hookrightarrow y \notin X) \rightarrow x \notin X) \rightarrow \forall x(x \notin X))$$

where $\mathbf{Y} = (\lambda x \lambda f(f)(x)xf)\lambda x \lambda f(f)(x)xf$ (Turing fixpoint combinator).

Let $\xi \in \Lambda$ be such that $\xi \Vdash \forall x(\forall y(\langle y \prec x \rangle = 1 \hookrightarrow y \notin X_0) \rightarrow x \notin X_0)$, X_0 being any individual in $\mathcal{M}$. We set $F[x] \equiv (\forall \pi \in \|x \notin X_0\|)(\mathbf{Y} \star \xi \cdot \pi \in \perp)$, and we have to show $\forall x F[x]$.

Since $\prec$ is a well founded relation, it suffices to show $\forall x(\forall y(y \prec x \rightarrow F[y]) \rightarrow F[x])$, or else $\neg F[x_0] \rightarrow (\exists y \prec x_0) \neg F[y]$, for any individual x_0 .

By the hypothesis $\neg F[x_0]$, there exists $\pi_0 \in \|x_0 \notin X_0\|$ such that $\mathbf{Y} \star \xi \cdot \pi_0 \notin \perp$ and therefore, we have $\xi \star \mathbf{Y} \xi \cdot \pi_0 \notin \perp$.

By hypothesis on ξ , we deduce $\mathbf{Y} \xi \not\Vdash \forall y(\langle y \prec x_0 \rangle = 1 \hookrightarrow y \notin X_0)$.

Thus, there exists $y_0 \prec x_0$ such that $\mathbf{Y} \xi \not\Vdash y_0 \notin X_0$.

Therefore, we have $(\exists \pi \in \|y_0 \notin X_0\|)(\mathbf{Y} \star \xi \cdot \pi \notin \perp)$, that is $\neg F[y_0]$.

Q.E.D.

Definition of a rank function

Definition. A function with domain D is an individual ϕ such that :

$$(\forall z \varepsilon \phi)(\exists x \varepsilon D) \exists y(z = (x, y)) ; (\forall x \varepsilon D) \exists y((x, y) \varepsilon \phi) ;$$

$$\forall x \forall y \forall y'((x, y) \varepsilon \phi, (x, y') \varepsilon \phi \rightarrow y = y').$$

Let ϕ be a function with domain D and $F[y, \vec{z}]$ a formula of ZF_ε . Then, the formula : $\exists y\{(x, y) \varepsilon \phi, F[y, \vec{z}]\}$ is denoted by $F[\phi(x), \vec{z}]$.

Remark. Beware, despite the same notation $\phi(x)$, it is not a function symbol.

By means of theorem 3, we define the binary function symbol Im by setting :

$$\text{Im}(\phi, D) = \{y ; (\exists x \varepsilon D) (x, y) \varepsilon \phi\}.$$

When ϕ is a function with domain D , we shall use, for $\text{Im}(\phi, D)$, the more intuitive notation $\{\phi(x) ; x \varepsilon D\}$, which we call *image of the function ϕ* .

Let $D' \subseteq D$, that is $\forall x(x \notin D \rightarrow x \notin D')$; a restriction of ϕ to D' is, by definition, a function ϕ' with domain D' such that $\phi' \subseteq \phi$.

For instance, $\{z \varepsilon \phi ; (\exists x \varepsilon D') \exists y(z = (x, y))\}$ is a restriction of ϕ to D' .

If ϕ'_0, ϕ'_1 are both restrictions of ϕ to D' , then $\phi'_0 \cong \phi'_1$.

Definition.

A binary relation $\prec$ is called *ranked*, if we have $\forall x \exists y \forall z (z \prec x \rightarrow z \varepsilon y)$, in other words : the minorants of any individual form a set.

By theorem 3, if the relation $\prec$ is ranked and defined by a formula $P[x, y, \vec{u}]$ of ZF_ε with parameters $\vec{u}$ in $\mathcal{N}$, we have :

$\mathcal{N} \models \forall x \forall y (x \prec y \leftrightarrow x \varepsilon f(y, \vec{u}))$, for some symbol of function f , defined in $\mathcal{M}$.

In what follows, we suppose that $\prec$ is a ranked *transitive* binary relation.

A function ϕ with domain $\{x ; x \prec a\}$ will be called *a-inductive for $\prec$* , if we have :

$\phi(x) \simeq \{\phi(y) ; y \prec x\}$ for every $x \prec a$. In other words :

$(\forall x \prec a)(\forall y \prec x) \phi(y) \in \phi(x) ; (\forall x \prec a)(\forall z \varepsilon \phi(x))(\exists y \prec x) z \simeq \phi(y)$.

If ϕ is *a-inductive for $\prec$* , we set $O(\phi, a) = \{\phi(x) ; x \prec a\}$ (image of ϕ).

Lemma 9. *Let ϕ, ϕ' be two functions, a-inductive for $\prec$. Then :*

- i) $\phi(x) \simeq \phi'(x)$ for every $x \prec a$.
- ii) $O(\phi, a) \simeq O(\phi', a)$.
- iii) $(\forall x \prec a) On(\phi(x)) ; O(\phi, a)$ is an ordinal, called ordinal of ϕ .

i) Proof by induction on $\phi(x)$, following $\in$: if $u \varepsilon \phi(x)$, then $u \simeq \phi(y)$ with $y \prec x$.

Since $\phi(y) \in \phi(x)$, we have $\phi(y) \simeq \phi'(y)$ by the induction hypothesis ;

therefore $\phi(y) \in \phi'(x)$ and $\phi(x) \subset \phi'(x)$.

Conversely, if $u \varepsilon \phi'(x)$, then $u \simeq \phi'(y)$ with $y \prec x$. Thus, we have $\phi(y) \in \phi(x)$, and therefore $\phi(y) \simeq \phi'(y)$ by the induction hypothesis ; therefore $u \in \phi(x)$ and $\phi'(x) \subset \phi(x)$.

ii) Immediate, by (i).

iii) We show $On(\phi(x))$ by induction on $\phi(x)$, for the well founded relation $\in$:

If $u \varepsilon \phi(x)$, we have $u \simeq \phi(y)$ with $y \prec x$; therefore, we have $On(u)$ by the induction hypothesis. If $v \varepsilon u$, then $v \varepsilon \phi(y)$, therefore $v \simeq \phi(z)$ with $z \prec y$; therefore $v \in \phi(x)$.

It follows that $\phi(x)$ is a transitive set of ordinals, thus an ordinal.

Then, $O(\phi, a)$ is also a transitive set of ordinals, and therefore an ordinal.

Q.E.D.

Lemma 10. *If ϕ is a-inductive for $\prec$, and if $b \prec a$, then every restriction ψ of ϕ to the domain $\{x ; x \prec b\}$ is a b-inductive function for $\prec$.*

Indeed, we have, $\psi(x) = \phi(x) \simeq \{\phi(y) ; y \prec x\} \simeq \{\psi(y) ; y \prec x\}$.

Q.E.D.

By means of theorem 2, we define a unary function symbol Φ , such that :

$\forall x (\forall f \varepsilon \Phi(x)) (f \text{ is a } x\text{-inductive function}) ;$

$\forall x \forall f \left(f \text{ is a } x\text{-inductive function} \rightarrow \exists f (f \varepsilon \Phi(x)) \right).$

In other words, $\Phi(x)$ is a set of *x-inductive functions*, which is non void if there exists at least one such function.

Finally, we define the unary function symbol Rk , using theorem 4, by setting :

$$Rk(x) = \bigcup \{O(f, x) ; f \varepsilon \Phi(x)\}$$

(the symbol $\bigcup$ is defined after theorem 1).

Therefore, $Rk(x)$ is the union of the ordinals of the *x-inductive functions* in the set $\Phi(x)$.

Since all these ordinals are extensionally equivalent, by lemma 9(ii), their union $\text{Rk}(x)$ is also an equivalent ordinal.

Remarks.

If there exists no x -inductive function, then $\text{Rk}(x)$ is void.

The function symbols $\text{O}, \Phi, \text{Rk}$ have additional arguments, which are the parameters $\vec{u}$ of the formula $P[x, y, \vec{u}]$ which defines the relation $y \prec x$.

We suppose now that $\prec$ is a ranked transitive relation, which is *well founded*. It is therefore a *strict ordering*.

Lemma 11. *Every restriction of Rk to the domain $\{x ; x \prec a\}$ is an a -inductive function for $\prec$.*

Proof by induction on a , following $\prec$.

Let f be a restriction of Rk to the domain $\{x ; x \prec a\}$ and let $x \prec a$. We must show that $f(x) \simeq \{f(y) ; y \prec x\}$, in other words, that we have :

$$\text{Rk}(x) \simeq \{\text{Rk}(y) ; y \prec x\}.$$

Let ψ be any restriction of Rk to the domain $\{y ; y \prec x\}$. By the induction hypothesis, ψ is a x -inductive function for $\prec$.

We now show that $\text{Rk}(x) \simeq \{\text{Rk}(y) ; y \prec x\}$:

i) If $u \in \text{Rk}(x)$ then $u \in \text{O}(\phi, x)$ for some function ϕ which is x -inductive for $\prec$, *provided that there exists such a function*. Now, there exists effectively one, otherwise $\text{Rk}(x)$ would be void.

Therefore, by definition of $\text{O}(\phi, x)$, we have $u = \phi(y)$ with $y \prec x$. But $\text{Rk}(y) \simeq \phi(y)$, since ϕ, ψ are both x -inductive functions for $\prec$, and $\psi(y) = \text{Rk}(y)$ (lemma 9(i)).

Therefore, we have $u \simeq \text{Rk}(y)$, with $y \prec x$.

ii) Conversely, if $y \prec x$, then $\text{Rk}(y) = \psi(y)$. Let $\phi \in \Phi(x)$; then ϕ, ψ are x -inductive for $\prec$; therefore $\phi(y) \simeq \psi(y)$ (lemma 9(i)).

Now $\phi(y) \in \text{O}(\phi, x)$, and therefore $\phi(y) \in \text{Rk}(x)$ by definition of $\text{Rk}(x)$.

It follows that $\text{Rk}(y) = \psi(y) \in \text{Rk}(x)$.

Q.E.D.

Theorem 12. *We have $\text{Rk}(x) \simeq \{\text{Rk}(y) ; y \prec x\}$ for every x .*

Proof by induction on x , following $\prec$; let ψ be any restriction of Rk to the domain $\{y ; y \prec x\}$. By lemma 11, ψ is a x -inductive function for $\prec$.

Then, we finish the proof, by repeating paragraphs (i) and (ii) of the proof of lemma 11.

Q.E.D.

Rk is called the *rank function* of the ranked, well founded and transitive relation $\prec$.

$\text{Rk}(x)$ is, for every x , a representative of the ordinal of any x -inductive function for $\prec$.

The values of the rank function Rk form an initial segment of On , which we shall call *the image of Rk* . It is therefore, *either an ordinal, or the whole of On* .

Proposition 13. *Let $\prec_0, \prec_1$ be two ranked transitive well founded relations, and f a function such that $\forall x \forall y (x \prec_0 y \rightarrow f(x) \prec_1 f(y))$.*

If Rk_0, Rk_1 are their rank functions, then we have $\forall x (\text{Rk}_0(x) \leq \text{Rk}_1(f(x)))$, and the image of Rk_0 is an initial segment of the image of Rk_1 .

We show immediately $\forall x (\text{Rk}_0(x) \leq \text{Rk}_1(f(x)))$ by induction following $\prec_0$. Hence the result, since the image of a rank function is an initial segment of On .

Q.E.D.

An ultrafilter on $\mathbb{J}2$

In all of the following, we write $y < x$ for $y \in \text{Cl}(x)$ in $\mathcal{M}$, where $\text{Cl}(x)$ denotes the transitive closure of x . It is a strict well founded ordering (many other such orderings would do the job, for instance the relation $\text{rank}(y) < \text{rank}(x)$).

The binary function symbol $\langle y < x \rangle$ is therefore defined in $\mathcal{N}$, with values in $\mathbb{J}2$.

By theorem 8, the binary relation $\langle y < x \rangle = 1$ is well founded in $\mathcal{N}$.

Theorem 14. $\Vdash$ *There exists an ultrafilter $\mathcal{D}$ on $\mathbb{J}2$, which is defined as follows : $\mathcal{D} = \{\alpha \in \mathbb{J}2 ; \text{ the relation } \langle y < x \rangle \geq \alpha \text{ is well founded } \}$.*

Remark. By lemma 5, the formula $\langle y < x \rangle \geq \alpha$ may be written $\langle \alpha y < \alpha x \rangle = \alpha$.

The formula $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}$, which we shall also write $\mathcal{D}[\alpha]$, is therefore :

$$\mathcal{D}[\alpha] \equiv \forall X (\forall x (\forall y (\langle y < x \rangle \geq \alpha \hookrightarrow y \notin X) \rightarrow x \notin X) \rightarrow \forall x (x \notin X))$$

Remark. We have :

$$\mathcal{D}[1] \equiv \forall X (\forall x (\forall y (\langle y < x \rangle = 1 \hookrightarrow y \notin X) \rightarrow x \notin X) \rightarrow \forall x (x \notin X)).$$

$$\mathcal{D}[0] \equiv \forall X ((\emptyset \notin X \rightarrow \emptyset \notin X) \rightarrow \emptyset \notin X).$$

We have immediately : $\lambda x x \Vdash \neg \mathcal{D}[0] ; \mathbf{Y} \Vdash \mathcal{D}[1] ;$

$\mathbf{I} \Vdash \forall \alpha^{\mathbb{J}2} \forall \beta^{\mathbb{J}2} (\alpha \leq \beta \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{D}[\alpha] \rightarrow \mathcal{D}[\beta]))$ (more precisely : $\|\mathcal{D}[1]\| \subset \|\mathcal{D}[0]\|$).

Therefore, in order to prove theorem 14, it suffices to show :

$\Vdash \forall \alpha^{\mathbb{J}2} \forall \beta^{\mathbb{J}2} (\alpha \wedge \beta = 0 \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{D}[\alpha \vee \beta] \rightarrow \mathcal{D}[\alpha] \vee \mathcal{D}[\beta]))$; see theorem 15 ;

$\Vdash \forall \alpha^{\mathbb{J}2} \forall \beta^{\mathbb{J}2} (\alpha \wedge \beta = 0 \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{D}[\alpha], \mathcal{D}[\beta] \rightarrow \perp))$; or even only :

$\Vdash \forall \alpha^{\mathbb{J}2} (\mathcal{D}[\alpha], \mathcal{D}[\neg \alpha] \rightarrow \perp)$; see theorem 22.

Notation. For $\alpha \in \mathbb{J}2$, we shall write $x <_\alpha y$ for $\langle x < y \rangle \geq \alpha$.

Theorem 15.

i) $\Vdash \forall \alpha^{\mathbb{J}2} \forall \beta^{\mathbb{J}2} (\alpha \wedge \beta = 0 \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{D}[\alpha \vee \beta] \rightarrow \mathcal{D}[\alpha] \vee \mathcal{D}[\beta]))$.

ii) $\Vdash \forall \alpha^{\mathbb{J}2} \forall \beta^{\mathbb{J}2} (\mathcal{D}[\alpha \vee \beta] \rightarrow \mathcal{D}[\alpha] \vee \mathcal{D}[\beta])$.

i) Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{J}2$ be such that $\alpha \wedge \beta = 0, \neg \mathcal{D}[\alpha], \neg \mathcal{D}[\beta]$. We have to show $\neg \mathcal{D}[\alpha \vee \beta]$.

By hypothesis on α and β , there exists individuals a_0, A (resp. b_0, B) such that $a_0 \in A$ (resp. $b_0 \in B$) and A (resp. B) has no minimal ε -element for $<_\alpha$ (resp. for $<_\beta$). We set :

$$c_0 = \alpha a_0 \sqcup \beta b_0 \text{ and } C = \{\alpha x \sqcup \beta y ; x \in A, y \in B\}.$$

Therefore, we have $c_0 \in C$; it suffices to show that C has no minimal ε -element for $<_{\alpha \vee \beta}$.

Let $c \in C, c = \alpha a \sqcup \beta b$, with $a \in A, b \in B$. By hypothesis on A, B , there exists $a' \in A$ and $b' \in B$ such that $a' <_\alpha a, b' <_\beta b$. If we set $c' = \alpha a' \sqcup \beta b'$, we have $c' \in C$, as needed. We also have :

$\langle c' = a' \rangle \geq \alpha, \langle a' < a \rangle \geq \alpha, \langle c = a \rangle \geq \alpha$; it follows that $\langle c' < c \rangle \geq \alpha$.

In the same way, we have $\langle c' < c \rangle \geq \beta$ and therefore, finally, $\langle c' < c \rangle \geq \alpha \vee \beta$.

ii) We set $\beta' = \beta \wedge (\neg \alpha)$; we have $\alpha \wedge \beta' = 0$ and $\alpha \vee \beta' = \alpha \vee \beta$. Therefore, we have :

$\mathcal{D}[\alpha \vee \beta] \rightarrow \mathcal{D}[\alpha] \vee \mathcal{D}[\beta]$. Now, we have $\beta' \leq \beta$ and therefore $\mathcal{D}[\beta'] \rightarrow \mathcal{D}[\beta]$.

Q.E.D.

Lemma 16.

- i) $I \Vdash \forall x \forall y (\langle x < y \rangle \neq 1 \rightarrow x \notin y)$.
- ii) If $\mathcal{M} \models u \in v$, then $I \Vdash u \varepsilon \mathfrak{I}v$.
- iii) $I \Vdash \forall x \forall y \forall \alpha^{\mathfrak{I}2} (\langle x < y \rangle \geq \alpha \hookrightarrow \alpha x \varepsilon \mathfrak{I}Cl(\{y\}))$.
- iv) $\Vdash \forall x \forall y (\langle x < y \rangle = 1 \leftrightarrow x \varepsilon \mathfrak{I}Cl(y))$.

Let a, b be two individuals.

- i) Let $\xi \Vdash \langle a < b \rangle \neq 1$, $\pi \in \|a \notin b\|$; then $(a, \pi) \in b$, therefore $\langle a < b \rangle = 1$ and $\xi \Vdash \perp$; therefore $\xi \star \pi \in \perp$.
- ii) Indeed, we have $\|u \notin \mathfrak{I}v\| = \{\pi \in \Pi ; (u, \pi) \in v \times \Pi\} = \Pi$.
- iii) Let $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$ and $a, b \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\langle a < b \rangle \geq \alpha$.
If $\alpha = 0$, we must show $I \Vdash \emptyset \varepsilon \mathfrak{I}Cl(\{y\})$ which follows from (ii).
If $\alpha = 1$, then $\langle a < b \rangle = 1$, that is $a \in Cl(b)$, therefore $a \in Cl(\{b\})$.
From (ii), it follows that $I \Vdash a \varepsilon \mathfrak{I}Cl(\{b\})$.
- iv) Indeed, if a, b are individuals of $\mathcal{M}$, we have trivially :
 $\|\langle a < b \rangle \neq 1\| = \|a \notin \mathfrak{I}Cl(b)\|$.

Q.E.D.

Lemma 17. *The well founded relation $\langle x < y \rangle = 1$ is ranked, and its rank function R has for image the whole of On .*

Lemma 16(iv) shows that this relation is ranked.

Let ρ be an ordinal and r an individual $\simeq \rho$. We show, by induction on ρ , that $R(r) \geq \rho$. Indeed, for every $\rho' \in \rho$, there exists $r' \varepsilon r$ such that $r' \simeq \rho'$. We have $R(r') \geq \rho'$ by induction hypothesis, and $\langle r' < r \rangle = 1$ from lemma 16(i). Therefore, we have $\rho' \in R(r)$ by definition of R , and finally $R(r) \geq \rho$. This shows that the image of R is not bounded in On . Since it is an initial segment, it is the whole of On .

Q.E.D.

Theorem 18. *Let $F(x, y)$ be a formula of ZF_ε , with parameters. Then, we have :*

$$I \Vdash \forall x \forall y (\forall \varpi^{\mathfrak{I}1} F(x, f(x, \varpi)) \rightarrow F(x, y))$$

for some function symbol f , defined dans $\mathcal{M}$, with domain $\mathcal{M} \times \Pi$.

Since the ground model $\mathcal{M}$ satisfies $V = L$ (or only the *choice principle*), we can define, in $\mathcal{M}$, a function symbol f such that :

$$\forall x \forall y (\forall \varpi \in \Pi) (\varpi \in \|F(x, y)\| \rightarrow \varpi \in \|F(x, f(x, \varpi))\|).$$

Let a, b be individuals, $\xi \Vdash \forall \varpi^{\mathfrak{I}1} F(a, f(a, \varpi))$ and $\pi \in \|F(a, b)\|$.

Thus, we have $\pi \in \|F(a, f(a, \pi))\|$, and therefore $\xi \star \pi \in \perp$.

Q.E.D.

Definitions. Let a be any individual of $\mathcal{N}$ and κ an ordinal (therefore, κ is not an individual of $\mathcal{N}$, but an equivalence class for $\simeq$).

A *function* or *application* from κ into a is, by definition, a binary relation $R(\rho, x)$ such that : $\forall x \forall x' (\forall \rho, \rho' \in \kappa) (R(\rho, x), R(\rho', x'), \rho \simeq \rho' \rightarrow x = x')$; $(\forall \rho \in \kappa) (\exists x \varepsilon a) R(\rho, x)$.

It is an *injection* if we have $\forall x (\forall \rho, \rho' \in \kappa) (R(\rho, x), R(\rho', x) \rightarrow \rho \simeq \rho')$.

A *surjection* from a onto κ is a function f of domain a such that :

$$(\forall \rho \in \kappa) (\exists x \varepsilon a) f(x) \simeq \rho.$$

Theorem 19.

For any individual a , there exists an ordinal κ , such that there is no surjection from a onto κ .

Let f be a surjection from a onto an ordinal ρ . We define a strict ordering relation $\prec_f$ by setting $x \prec_f y \Leftrightarrow x \in a \wedge y \in a \wedge f(x) < f(y)$. It is clear that this relation is well founded, that f is an a -inductive function, and that $O(f, a) \simeq \rho$.

We may consider this relation as a subset of $a \times a$.

By means of the axioms of union, power set and collection given above (theorems 1–4), we define an ordinal κ_0 , which is the union of the $O(f, a)$ for all the functions f which are a -inductive for some well founded strict ordering relation on a .

In fact, we consider the set :

$$\mathcal{B}(a) = \{X \in \overline{\mathcal{P}}(a \times a) ; X \text{ is a well founded strict ordering relation on } a\}.$$

Then, we set $\kappa_0 = \bigcup \{O(f, a) ; X \in \mathcal{B}(a), f \in \Phi(X, a)\}$.

In this definition, we use the function symbol Φ , defined after lemma 10, which associates with each well founded strict ordering relation X on a , a *non void* set of a -inductive functions for this relation.

Then, there exists no surjection from a onto $\kappa_0 + 1$.

Q.E.D.

We denote by Δ the first ordinal of $\mathcal{N}$ such that there is no surjection from $\mathbb{N}$ onto Δ : for every function ϕ , there exists $\delta \in \Delta$ such that $\forall x^{\mathbb{N}} (\phi(x) \neq \delta)$.

For each $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $\mathcal{N}_\alpha$ the class defined by the formula $x = \alpha x$.

Lemma 20. Let $\alpha_0, \alpha_1 \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha_0 \wedge \alpha_1 = 0$ and R_0 (resp. R_1) be a functional relation of domain $\mathcal{N}_{\alpha_0}$ (resp. $\mathcal{N}_{\alpha_1}$) with values in On . Then, either R_0 , or R_1 , is not surjective onto Δ .

Proof by contradiction : we suppose that R_0 and R_1 are both surjective onto Δ .

We apply theorem 18 to the formula $F(x_0, x_1) \equiv \neg(R_0(\alpha_0 x_0) \simeq R_1(\alpha_1 x_1))$, and we get :

$$\forall x_0 (\exists x_1 (R_0(\alpha_0 x_0) \simeq R_1(\alpha_1 x_1)) \rightarrow \exists \varpi^{\mathbb{N}} (R_0(\alpha_0 x_0) \simeq R_1(\alpha_1 f(x_0, \varpi))))$$

where f is a suitable function symbol (therefore defined in $\mathcal{M}$).

Replacing x_0 with $\alpha_0 x_0$, we obtain :

$$\forall x_0 (\exists x_1 (R_0(\alpha_0 x_0) \simeq R_1(\alpha_1 x_1)) \rightarrow \exists \varpi^{\mathbb{N}} (R_0(\alpha_0 x_0) \simeq R_1(\alpha_1 f(\alpha_0 x_0, \varpi)))).$$

But, by lemma 5(i), we have $\alpha_1 f(\alpha_0 x, \varpi) = \alpha_1 f(\alpha_1 \alpha_0 x, \varpi) = \alpha_1 f(\emptyset, \varpi)$. It follows that :

$$\forall x_0 (\exists x_1 (R_0(\alpha_0 x_0) \simeq R_1(\alpha_1 x_1)) \rightarrow \exists \varpi^{\mathbb{N}} (R_0(\alpha_0 x_0) \simeq R_1(\alpha_1 f(\emptyset, \varpi)))).$$

By hypothesis, we have $(\forall \rho \in \Delta) \exists x_0 \exists x_1 (\rho \simeq R_0(\alpha_0 x_0) \simeq R_1(\alpha_1 x_1))$. It follows that :

$(\forall \rho \in \Delta) \exists x_0 \exists \varpi^{\mathbb{N}} (\rho \simeq R_0(\alpha_0 x_0) \simeq R_1(\alpha_1 f(\emptyset, \varpi)))$; therefore, we have :

$(\forall \rho \in \Delta) \exists \varpi^{\mathbb{N}} (\rho \simeq R_1(\alpha_1 f(\emptyset, \varpi)))$.

Therefore, the function $\varpi \mapsto R_1(\alpha_1 f(\emptyset, \varpi))$ is a surjection from $\mathbb{N}$ onto Δ . But this is a contradiction with the definition de Δ .

Remark. We should write $f(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, x_0, \varpi)$ instead of $f(x_0, \varpi)$, since the function symbol f depends on the four variables $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, x_0, \varpi$. In fact, it depends also on the parameters which appear in R_0, R_1 . The proof does not change.

Q.E.D.

Corollary 21. *Let $\alpha_0, \alpha_1 \in \mathbb{I}2$, $\alpha_0 \wedge \alpha_1 = 0$, and $\prec_0, \prec_1$ be two well founded ranked strict ordering relations with respective domains $\mathcal{N}_{\alpha_0}, \mathcal{N}_{\alpha_1}$. Let Rk_0, Rk_1 be their rank functions. Then, either the image of Rk_0 , or that of Rk_1 is an ordinal $< \Delta$.*

In order to be able to define the rank functions Rk_0, Rk_1 , we consider the relations $\prec'_0, \prec'_1$, with domain the whole of $\mathcal{N}$, defined by $x \prec'_i y \equiv (x = \alpha_i x) \wedge (y = \alpha_i y) \wedge (x \prec_i y)$ for $i = 0, 1$.

These strict ordering relations are well founded and ranked.

Their rank functions Rk'_0, Rk'_1 take the value 0 outside $\mathcal{N}_{\alpha_0}, \mathcal{N}_{\alpha_1}$ respectively : indeed, all the individuals outside $\mathcal{N}_{\alpha_i}$ are minimal for $\prec'_i$.

By lemma 20, one of them, Rk'_0 for instance, is not surjective onto Δ .

Since the image of any rank function is an initial segment of On , the image of Rk_0 is an ordinal $< \Delta$.

Q.E.D.

Theorem 22.

i) $\Vdash \forall \alpha_0 \mathbb{I}2 \forall \alpha_1 \mathbb{I}2 (\alpha_0 \wedge \alpha_1 = 0 \hookrightarrow (\mathcal{D}[\alpha_0], \mathcal{D}[\alpha_1] \rightarrow \perp))$.

ii) $\Vdash \forall \alpha_0 \mathbb{I}2 \forall \alpha_1 \mathbb{I}2 (\mathcal{D}[\alpha_0], \mathcal{D}[\alpha_1] \rightarrow \mathcal{D}[\alpha_0 \wedge \alpha_1])$.

i) In $\mathcal{N}$, let $\alpha_0, \alpha_1 \in \mathbb{I}2$ be such that $\alpha_0 \wedge \alpha_1 = 0$ and the relations $\langle x < y \rangle \geq \alpha_0, \langle x < y \rangle \geq \alpha_1$ be well founded. Therefore, we have $\alpha_0, \alpha_1 \neq 0, 1$.

Therefore, the relations $x \prec_i y \equiv (x = \alpha_i x) \wedge (y = \alpha_i y) \wedge (\langle x < y \rangle = \alpha_i)$ for $i = 0, 1$, are well founded strict orderings.

From lemma 16(iii), it follows that these relations are *ranked*.

Now, by lemma 5, we have : $\Vdash \forall x \forall y \forall \alpha \mathbb{I}2 (\langle x < y \rangle = 1 \rightarrow \langle \alpha x < \alpha y \rangle = \alpha)$.

But, by lemma 17, the rank function of the well founded relation $\langle x < y \rangle = 1$ has for image the whole of On . Therefore, by proposition 13, the same is true for the rank functions of the well founded strict order relations $x \prec_0 y$ and $x \prec_1 y$.

But this contradicts corollary 21.

ii) We have $\alpha_0 \leq (\alpha_0 \wedge \alpha_1) \vee (-\alpha_1)$. Therefore, by $\mathcal{D}[\alpha_0]$ and theorem 15, we have $\mathcal{D}[\alpha_0 \wedge \alpha_1]$ or $\mathcal{D}[-\alpha_1]$. But $\mathcal{D}[-\alpha_1]$ is impossible, by $\mathcal{D}[\alpha_1]$ and (i).

Q.E.D.

Corollary 23. $\mathcal{D}[\alpha]$ is equivalent with each one of the following propositions :

i) *There exists a well founded ranked strict ordering relation $\prec$ with domain $\mathcal{N}_\alpha$, the rank function of which has an image $\geq \Delta$.*

ii) *There exists a function with domain $\mathcal{N}_\alpha$ which is surjective onto Δ .*

$\mathcal{D}[\alpha] \Rightarrow$ (i) :

By definition of $\mathcal{D}[\alpha]$, the binary relation $(x = \alpha x) \wedge (y = \alpha y) \wedge (\langle x < y \rangle = \alpha)$ is well founded. By lemma 16(iii), this relation is ranked. We have seen, in the proof of theorem 22, that the image of its rank function is the whole of On .

(i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) : obvious.

(ii) $\Rightarrow \mathcal{D}[\alpha]$:

Since $\mathcal{D}$ is an ultrafilter, it suffices to show $\neg \mathcal{D}[-\alpha]$. But, (ii) and $\mathcal{D}[-\alpha]$ contradict lemma 20.

Q.E.D.

Theorem 24.

If $\mathfrak{J}2$ is non trivial, there exists no set, which is totally ordered by ε , the ordinal of which is $\geq \Delta$.

Let $\alpha \varepsilon \mathfrak{J}2, \alpha \neq 0, 1$ and X be a set which is totally ordered by ε , and equipotent with Δ . Then, we show that the application $x \mapsto \alpha x$ is an injection from X into $\mathcal{N}_\alpha$:

Indeed, by lemma 16(i), we have $x \varepsilon y \rightarrow \langle x < y \rangle = 1$ and, by lemma 5, we have : $\langle x < y \rangle = 1 \rightarrow \langle \alpha x < \alpha y \rangle = \alpha$. Therefore, if $x, y \varepsilon X$ and $x \neq y$, we have, for instance $x \varepsilon y$, therefore $\langle \alpha x < \alpha y \rangle = \alpha$ and therefore $\alpha x \neq \alpha y$ since $\alpha \neq 0$.

Thus, there exists a function with domain $\mathcal{N}_\alpha$ which is surjective onto Δ . The same reasoning, applied to $\neg\alpha$ gives the same result for $\neg\alpha$. But this contradicts lemma 20.

Q.E.D.

Remark. Theorem 24 shows that it is impossible to define Von Neumann ordinals in $\mathcal{N}$, with ε instead of $\in$, unless $\mathfrak{J}2$ is trivial, i.e. the realizability model is, in fact, a forcing model.

The model $\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{D}$

For each formula $F[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ of ZF, we have defined, in the ground model $\mathcal{M}$, an n -ary function symbol with values in $\{0, 1\}$, denoted by $\langle F[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rangle$, by setting, for any individuals $a_1, \dots, a_n$ of $\mathcal{M}$: $\langle F[a_1, \dots, a_n] \rangle = 1 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{M} \models F[a_1, \dots, a_n]$.

In $\mathcal{N}$, the function symbol $\langle F[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rangle$ takes its values in the Boolean algebra $\mathfrak{J}2$.

We define, in $\mathcal{N}$, two binary relations $\in_\mathcal{D}$ and $=_\mathcal{D}$, by setting :

$$(x \in_\mathcal{D} y) \equiv \mathcal{D}[\langle x \in y \rangle] ; (x =_\mathcal{D} y) \equiv \mathcal{D}[\langle x = y \rangle].$$

The class $\mathcal{N}$, equipped with these relations, will be denoted $\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{D}$.

For each formula $F[\vec{x}, y]$ of ZF, with $n + 1$ free variables $x_1, \dots, x_n, y$, we can define, by means of the *choice principle* in $\mathcal{M}$, an n -ary function symbol f_F , such that :

$$\mathcal{M} \models \forall \vec{x} (F[\vec{x}, f_F(\vec{x})] \rightarrow \forall y F[\vec{x}, y]) ;$$

f_F is called the *Skolem function* of the formula $F[\vec{x}, y]$.

Lemma 25.

- i) $I \Vdash \forall \vec{x} \forall y (\langle \forall y F[\vec{x}, y] \rangle \leq \langle F[\vec{x}, y] \rangle)$
- ii) $I \Vdash \forall \vec{x} \forall y (\langle \forall y F[\vec{x}, y] \rangle = \langle F[\vec{x}, f_F(\vec{x})] \rangle).$

Trivial.

Q.E.D.

For each formula $F[\vec{x}]$ of ZF, we define, by recurrence on F , a formula of ZF_ε , which has the same free variables, and that we denote $\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{D} \models F[\vec{x}]$.

- F is atomic : $(\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{D} \models x_1 \in x_2)$ is $x_1 \in_\mathcal{D} x_2$; $(\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{D} \models x_1 = x_2)$ is $x_1 =_\mathcal{D} x_2$; $(\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{D} \models \perp)$ is $\perp$.
- $F \equiv F_0 \rightarrow F_1$: then $(\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{D} \models F)$ is the formula $(\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{D} \models F_0) \rightarrow (\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{D} \models F_1)$.
- $F[\vec{x}] \equiv \forall y G[\vec{x}, y]$: then $(\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{D} \models F[\vec{x}])$ is the formula $\forall y (\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{D} \models G[\vec{x}, y])$.

Lemma 26. For each formula $F[\vec{x}]$ of ZF, we have $\Vdash \forall \vec{x} ((\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{D} \models F[\vec{x}]) \leftrightarrow \mathcal{D}[\langle F[\vec{x}] \rangle])$.

Proof by recurrence on the length of F .

If F is atomic, we have $\models \forall \vec{x} ((\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} \models F[\vec{x}]) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}\langle F[\vec{x}] \rangle)$

and $\models \forall \vec{x} (\mathcal{D}\langle F[\vec{x}] \rangle \rightarrow (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} \models F[\vec{x}]))$ since $(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} \models F[\vec{x}])$ is identical with $\mathcal{D}\langle F[\vec{x}] \rangle$.

If $F \equiv F_0 \rightarrow F_1$, the formula $(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} \models F) \leftrightarrow \mathcal{D}\langle F \rangle$ is :

$$((\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} \models F_0) \rightarrow (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} \models F_1)) \leftrightarrow \mathcal{D}\langle F_0 \rightarrow F_1 \rangle.$$

Since $\mathcal{D}$ is an ultrafilter, this formula is equivalent with :

$$((\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} \models F_0) \rightarrow (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} \models F_1)) \leftrightarrow (\mathcal{D}\langle F_0 \rangle \rightarrow \mathcal{D}\langle F_1 \rangle), \text{ which is a logical consequence of :}$$

$$(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} \models F_0) \leftrightarrow \mathcal{D}\langle F_0 \rangle \text{ and } (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} \models F_1) \leftrightarrow \mathcal{D}\langle F_1 \rangle.$$

Hence the result, by the recurrence hypothesis.

If $F[\vec{x}] \equiv \forall y G[\vec{x}, y]$, let $f_G(\vec{x})$ be the Skolem function of G .

Then, we have $(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} \models \forall y G[\vec{x}, y]) \equiv \forall y (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} \models G[\vec{x}, y])$, and therefore :

$$\models (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} \models \forall y G[\vec{x}, y]) \rightarrow (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} \models G[\vec{x}, f_G(\vec{x})]).$$

Therefore, by the recurrence hypothesis, we have :

$$\models (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} \models \forall y G[\vec{x}, y]) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}\langle G[\vec{x}, f_G(\vec{x})] \rangle.$$

Applying lemma 25(ii), we obtain $\models (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} \models \forall y G[\vec{x}, y]) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}\langle \forall y G[\vec{x}, y] \rangle$.

Conversely, by lemma 25(i), we have $\models \forall y (\mathcal{D}\langle \forall y G[\vec{x}, y] \rangle \rightarrow \mathcal{D}\langle G[\vec{x}, y] \rangle)$.

Therefore, applying the recurrence hypothesis, we obtain :

$$\models \mathcal{D}\langle \forall y G[\vec{x}, y] \rangle \rightarrow \forall y (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} \models G[\vec{x}, y]), \text{ and thus, by definition of } (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} \models \forall y G[\vec{x}, y]) :$$

$$\models \mathcal{D}\langle \forall y G[\vec{x}, y] \rangle \rightarrow (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} \models \forall y G[\vec{x}, y]).$$

Q.E.D.

Theorem 27. $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$ is an elementary extension of the ground model $\mathcal{M}$.

Let $F[\vec{a}]$ be a closed formula of ZF, with parameters $a_1, \dots, a_n$ in $\mathcal{M}$.

If $\mathcal{M} \models F[\vec{a}]$, we have $\langle F[\vec{a}] \rangle = 1$ (by definition), and therefore, of course, $\models \mathcal{D}\langle F[\vec{a}] \rangle$.

Therefore, by lemma 26, we have $\models (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} \models F[\vec{a}])$.

If $\mathcal{M} \not\models F[\vec{a}]$, then $\mathcal{M} \models \neg F[\vec{a}]$; therefore, we have $\models (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} \models \neg F[\vec{a}])$.

Q.E.D.

Remark. Theorem 27 is, in fact, true for any ultrafilter on $\mathfrak{I}2$, with the same proof.

Theorem 28. Let $\sqsubset$ be a well founded binary relation, defined in the ground model $\mathcal{M}$. Then the relation $\mathcal{D}\langle x \sqsubset y \rangle$ is well founded in the realizability model $\mathcal{N}$.

Remark. Theorem 28 is an improvement on theorem 8.

Notations. We shall write $x \sqsubset_{\mathcal{D}} y$ for $\langle x \sqsubset y \rangle \in \mathcal{D}$.

Recall that $x < y$ means $x \in \text{Cl}(y)$; and that $x <_{\alpha} y$ means $\langle x < y \rangle \geq \alpha$, for $\alpha \in \mathfrak{I}2$.

We define, in the model $\mathcal{M}$, a binary relation $\sqsubseteq$ on the class $\{0, 1\} \times \mathcal{M}$, by setting, for any $\alpha, \alpha' \in \{0, 1\}$ and a, a' in $\mathcal{M}$:

$$(\alpha', a') \sqsubseteq (\alpha, a) \Leftrightarrow (\alpha' < \alpha) \vee (\alpha = \alpha' = 0 \wedge a' < a) \vee (\alpha = \alpha' = 1 \wedge a' \sqsubset a).$$

The relation $\sqsubseteq$ is the *ordered direct sum* of the relations $\sqsubset, <$.

It is easily shown that it is *well founded* in $\mathcal{M}$.

The binary function symbol associated with this relation, of domain $\{0, 1\} \times \mathcal{M}$ and values in $\{0, 1\}$, is given by :

$$\langle (\alpha', a') \sqsubseteq (\alpha, a) \rangle = (\neg \alpha' \wedge \alpha) \vee (\neg \alpha' \wedge \neg \alpha \wedge \langle a' < a \rangle) \vee (\alpha' \wedge \alpha \wedge \langle a' \sqsubset a \rangle).$$

This definition gives, in $\mathcal{N}$, a binary function symbol with arguments in $\mathbb{I}2 \times \mathcal{N}$, and values in $\mathbb{I}2$.

By theorem 8, the binary relation $\langle(\alpha', a') \sqsubseteq (\alpha, a)\rangle = 1$ is well founded in $\mathcal{N}$.

Proof of theorem 28.

Proof by contradiction : we assume that the binary relation $\sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{D}}$ is not well founded.

Thus, there exists a_0, A_0 such that $a_0 \in A_0$ and A_0 has no minimal ε -element for $\sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{D}}$.

We define, in $\mathcal{N}$, the class $\mathcal{X}$ of ordered pairs (α, x) , such that :

There exists X such that $x \in X$ and X has no minimal ε -element, neither for $\sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{D}}$ nor for $<_{\neg\alpha}$.

Therefore, the formula $\mathcal{X}(\alpha, x)$ is :

$$\alpha \in \mathbb{I}2 \wedge \exists X \left\{ x \in X, (\forall u \in X) \{ (\exists v \in X)(v \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{D}} u), (\exists w \in X)(w <_{\neg\alpha} u) \} \right\}.$$

If (α, x) is in $\mathcal{X}$, then we have $\mathcal{D}(\alpha)$: indeed, the set X is non void and has no minimal ε -element for $<_{\neg\alpha}$. Therefore, we have $\neg\mathcal{D}(\neg\alpha)$, and thus $\mathcal{D}(\alpha)$, since $\mathcal{D}$ is an ultrafilter.

We obtain the desired contradiction by showing that the class $\mathcal{X}$ is non void and has no minimal element for the binary relation $\langle(\alpha', x') \sqsubseteq (\alpha, x)\rangle = 1$.

The ordered pair $(1, a_0)$ is in $\mathcal{X}$: indeed, we have $x <_0 x$ for every x , and therefore A_0 has no minimal ε -element for $<_0$.

Now let (α, a) be in $\mathcal{X}$; we search for (α', a') in $\mathcal{X}$ such that $\langle(\alpha', a') \sqsubseteq (\alpha, a)\rangle = 1$.

By hypothesis on (α, a) , there exists A such that $a \in A$ and A has no minimal ε -element, neither for $\sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{D}}$ nor for $<_{\neg\alpha}$. Thus, there exists $a^0, a^1 \in A$ such that we have $\mathcal{D}(a^0 \sqsubseteq a)$ and $a^1 <_{\neg\alpha} a$.

We set $\alpha' = (\alpha \wedge \langle a^0 \sqsubseteq a \rangle)$ and therefore, we have $\mathcal{D}(\alpha')$. We set $\beta = \neg\alpha' \wedge \alpha$; therefore $\alpha', \neg\alpha, \beta$ form a partition of 1 in the Boolean algebra $\mathbb{I}2$.

We have $\neg\mathcal{D}(\beta)$; therefore, by definition of $\mathcal{D}$, the relation $<_{\beta}$ is not well founded. Thus, there exists b, B such that $b \in B$ and B has no minimal ε -element for $<_{\beta}$. Then, we set :

$$a' = \alpha' a^0 \sqcup (\neg\alpha) a^1 \sqcup \beta b \text{ and } A' = \{ \alpha' x \sqcup (\neg\alpha) y \sqcup \beta z ; x, y \in A, z \in B \}.$$

Therefore, we have $a' \in A'$, as needed ; moreover :

$$\neg\alpha' \wedge \neg\alpha \wedge \langle a' < a \rangle = \neg\alpha, \text{ since } \neg\alpha' \geq \neg\alpha \text{ and } \langle a' < a \rangle \geq \neg\alpha \wedge \langle a^1 < a \rangle = \neg\alpha ;$$

$$\alpha' \wedge \alpha \wedge \langle a' \sqsubseteq a \rangle = \alpha' \wedge \langle a' \sqsubseteq a \rangle = \alpha' \wedge \langle a^0 \sqsubseteq a \rangle = \alpha'.$$

By definition of $\langle(\alpha', a') \sqsubseteq (\alpha, a)\rangle$, it follows that $\langle(\alpha', a') \sqsubseteq (\alpha, a)\rangle = \beta \vee \neg\alpha \vee \alpha' = 1$.

It remains to show that A' has no minimal ε -element for $\sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{D}}$ and for $<_{\neg\alpha'}$.

Therefore, let $u \in A'$, thus $u = \alpha' x \sqcup (\neg\alpha) y \sqcup \beta z$ with $x, y \in A$ and $z \in B$.

By hypothesis on A, B , there exists $x', y' \in A, x' \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{D}} x, y' <_{\neg\alpha} y$ and $z' \in B, z' <_{\beta} z$.

Then, if we set $u' = \alpha' x' \sqcup (\neg\alpha) y' \sqcup \beta z'$, we have $u' \in A'$.

Moreover, we have $\langle u' \sqsubseteq u \rangle \geq \alpha' \wedge \langle x' \sqsubseteq x \rangle$, and therefore $\mathcal{D}(u' \sqsubseteq u)$, that is $u' \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{D}} u$.

Finally, $\langle u' < u \rangle \geq (\neg\alpha \wedge \langle y' < y \rangle) \vee (\beta \wedge \langle z' < z \rangle) = \neg\alpha \vee \beta = \neg\alpha'$; therefore, we have $u' <_{\neg\alpha'} u$.

Q.E.D.

Theorem 29. $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$ is well founded, and therefore has the same ordinals as $\mathcal{N}'_{\varepsilon}$.

We apply theorem 28 to the binary relation $\in$ which is well founded in $\mathcal{M}$. We deduce that the relation $\mathcal{D}(x \in y)$, that is $x \in_{\mathcal{D}} y$, is well founded in $\mathcal{N}$.

Q.E.D.

The relation $\in_{\mathcal{D}}$ is well founded *and extensional*, which means that we have, in $\mathcal{N}$:

$$\forall x \forall y (\forall z (z \in_{\mathcal{D}} x \leftrightarrow z \in_{\mathcal{D}} y) \rightarrow \forall z (x \in_{\mathcal{D}} z \rightarrow y \in_{\mathcal{D}} z)).$$

It follows that we can define a *collapsing*, by means of a function symbol Φ , which is an *isomorphism* of $(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}, \in_{\mathcal{D}})$ on a transitive class in the model $\mathcal{N}_{\in}$ of ZF, which contains the ordinals. This means that we have :

$$\forall x \forall y (y \in_{\mathcal{D}} x \rightarrow \Phi(y) \in \Phi(x)) ; \quad \forall x (\forall z \in \Phi(x)) (\exists y \in_{\mathcal{D}} x) z \simeq \Phi(y).$$

The definition of Φ is analogous with that of the *rank function* already defined for a *transitive* well founded relation. The details will be given in a later version of this paper. It follows that :

Theorem 30. *The realizability model $\mathcal{N}_{\in}$ contains a transitive class, which contains the ordinals and is an elementary extension of the ground model $\mathcal{M}$.*

Corollary 31. *The class $L^{\mathcal{M}}$ of constructible sets in $\mathcal{M}$ is an elementary submodel of $L^{\mathcal{N}}$.*

References

- [1] H.B. Curry, R. Feys. *Combinatory Logic*. North-Holland (1958).
- [2] T. Griffin. *A formulæ-as-type notion of control*.
Conf. record 17th A.C.M. Symp. on Principles of Progr. Languages (1990).
- [3] W. Howard. *The formulas-as-types notion of construction*.
Essays on combinatory logic, λ -calculus, and formalism, J.P. Seldin and J.R. Hindley ed., Acad. Press (1980) p. 479–490.
- [4] J.-L. Krivine. *Realizability algebras : a program to well order $\mathbb{R}$* .
Logical Methods in Computer Science vol. 7, 3:02 (2011) p. 1-47.
- [5] J.-L. Krivine. *Realizability algebras II : new models of $ZF + DC$* .
Logical Methods in Computer Science, vol. 8, 1:10 (2012) p. 1-28.
- [6] J.-L. Krivine. *Realizability algebras III : some examples*.
<http://arxiv.org/abs/1210.5065> (to appear).
- [7] A. Miquel. *Forcing as a program transformation*.
Logic in Computer Science (LICS'11) (2011) p. 197-206.